

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **2 August 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kish (USPub 2003/0212589, hereinafter “Kish”), in view of Lowensohn et al (USPub 2004/0230809, hereinafter “Lowensohn”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-25 were rejected as being unpatentable over in view of Lowensohn. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Kish and Lowensohn teaches storing and validating credentials **on a host computer** (see Kish, paragraph [0053]), or storing credentials in **a separate device** (see Lowensohn, paragraphs [0144]-[0153]).

In contrast, the present invention receives provisioning information, including a credential, **from a provisioning device** to facilitate becoming a member of a secure credential infrastructure (see FIG. 2, index 207, FIG. 6, and paragraphs [0046] and [0082]-[0089] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it facilitates becoming a member of a secure credential infrastructure without the necessity of being a member of a public key infrastructure (PKI). There is nothing within Kish or Lowensohn, either separately or in concert, which suggests receiving provisioning information, including a credential, from a provisioning device to facilitate becoming a member of a secure credential infrastructure.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13 to clarify that the present invention receives provisioning information, including a credential, from a provisioning device to facilitate becoming a member of a secure credential infrastructure. These amendments find support in FIG. 2, index 207, in FIG. 6, and in paragraphs [0046] and [0082]-[0089] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7, and 13 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that

claims 2-6 and 20-21, which depend upon claim 1, claims 8-12 and 22-23, which depend upon claim 7, and claims 14-19 and 24-25, which depend upon claim 13, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 25 October 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com